

REMARKS

Claims 1-33, all the claims pending in the application, stand rejected on prior art grounds. The specification and drawings are objected to. Claims 1, 2, 10-13, 21-23, 27, 29, 32, and 33 as well as the specification and drawings are amended herein. Applicants respectfully traverse these objections/rejections based on the following discussion.

I. The Objections to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to because, as pointed out on page 2 of the Office Action, in Figure 2, an arrow from element 270 to element 290 is needed to comply with the corresponding description in the specification. Accordingly, the Applicants have amended the drawings to include an additional arrow from element 270 to element 290 in Figure 2 in order to overcome this objection. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objections to the drawings.

II. The Objections to the Specification

The specification is objected to because of informalities in paragraph 48, wherein the number “630” referring to the bus in Figure 5 is incorrectly numbered. Accordingly, the Applicants have amended paragraph 48 of the specification to renumber “630” to “530” in accordance with the suggestion on page 3 of the Office Action in order to overcome this objection. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objections to the specification.

III. The Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1, 3-12, 14-23, and 25-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smyth et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,028,261) hereinafter referred to as “Smyth”, in view of Huang et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0133569), hereinafter referred to as “Huang”. Claims 2, 13, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smyth, in view of Huang, in further view of O’Brien et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,055,569), hereinafter referred to as “O’Brien”. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion.

Smyth teaches an internet website which presents a hierarchical menu structure to users includes a personalization engine to automatically modify the menu structure for each user at least according to that user’s previous browsing history at the site. In one embodiment the engine provides, as menu options for a selected menu page of the hierarchical menu, a plurality of the most probable links which the user may wish to reach from the selected menu page. In another embodiment there are provided, as additional menu options for a particular menu page, a plurality of links which are similar, as determined by meeting a predetermined similarity metric, to menu options present on the particular menu page other than through meeting the similarity metric.

Huang teaches a computer-implemented method and system for processing transactions between a client device and a web page. The system includes an adapter for receiving and interpreting a request from the client device, wherein the adapter is configured to interface with the client device. A generator retrieves a web page specified by the request. A transcoder receives the retrieved web page and applies a transcoding rule to extract data from the web page. The transcoding rule used is one of a set of predefined rules relating to the web page. The transcoder also transforms the data into a standardized form so that the adapter can then

modifying the standardized data into a compatible form for display by the client device.

Therefore, web based transactions can be performed by a variety of client devices, including portable, wireless and voice-based devices.

O'Brien teaches a smart browser working in conjunction with a HTTP server that selectively downloads WWW pages into the browser's memory cache. The determination of which pages to download is a function of a probability weight assigned to each link on a Web page. By evaluating that weight to a predetermined browser criteria, only those pages most probably to be downloaded are stored in the browser's memory cache. The download is done in the background while the browser user is viewing the current Web page on the monitor. This greatly enhances the speed with which the viewer can "cruise" the Web while at the same time conserving system resources by not requiring the system to download all the possible links.

However, the claimed invention, as provided in amended independent claims 1, 11, 12, 22, 23, and 33 contain features, which are patentably distinguishable from the prior art references of record. Specifically, claims 1, 11, 23, and 33 recite, in part, "...wherein the identifying process comprises any of graph analysis, statistical analysis, learning analysis, and response-time analysis, and wherein said learning analysis associates a penalty with an incorrect prediction of said components of said application that may be requested by said user in the future and biases a probability of selection of successive components more towards recently occurring historical patterns than older historical patterns;..." and "...wherein only said requested and identified components are adapted for operation with said requesting device." Similarly, claims 12 and 22 recite, in part, "...wherein said identify comprises any of graph analysis, statistical analysis, learning analysis, and response-time analysis, and wherein said learning analysis associates a penalty with an incorrect prediction of said components of said application that may be requested

by said user in the future and biases a probability of selection of successive components more towards recently occurring historical patterns than older historical patterns;..." and "...wherein only said requested and identified components are adapted for operation with said requesting device."

These features are neither taught nor suggested in the prior art references of record. In fact, page 8 of the Office Action admits that Smyth and Huang do not teach "wherein only said requested and identified components are adapted for operation with said requesting device," but in an attempt to reject the claims improperly uses O'Brien in combination with Smyth and Huang to reject the claims.

Insofar as references may be combined to teach a particular invention, and the proposed combination of Smyth, Huang and O'Brien, case law establishes that, before any prior-art references may be validly combined for use in a prior-art 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection, the individual references themselves or corresponding prior art must suggest that they be combined. However, there is nothing in each of the references that suggests such a motivation to combine as suggested in the Office Action. In fact, had such a motivation been anticipated in any of the prior art references, then surely some discussion regarding alternative embodiments or manners of combination would have been suggested or at least inferred in any of the prior art references. In fact, no suggestion for combination is provided in any of the prior art references.

Page 4 of the Office Action attempts to provide such a motivation for combination by citing column 1, lines 49-51 of Smyth as providing the motivation for combination. However, the column 1, lines 49-54 of Smyth merely states, "[i]n short, ensuring that mobile users gain access to the right information at the right time, both quickly and easily, is key to the future success of the mobile/wireless information revolution, including the current generation of WAP-

enabled services and the next generation of 3G information services.” There is nothing in the Applicants’ claims relating to mobile or wireless technologies. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicants’ invention would not likely combine references related to mobile or wireless technologies especially given the fact that the Applicants’ claims are not directed to these types of technologies. Accordingly, the reason given in the Office Action for the motivation to combine the references is moot and accordingly, the rejections are improper. Additionally, further evidence of the unobvious and unlikely combination of Smyth with Huang and O’Brien is established from the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office itself.

As evidence for the above, the Applicants note that even the USPTO has designated Smyth, Huang and O’Brien as non-analogous art. First, Smyth has been classified in U.S. classes 715/744; 715/745; 715/747; 715/765; and 715/763. Conversely, Huang has been classified in U.S. classes 709/219 and 705/37. Still conversely, O’Brien has been classified in U.S. classes 709/223; 709/203; and 709/224. Thus, there are no overlapping classes for Smyth, Huang and O’Brien. Therefore, if the USPTO with its vast repository of prior art references available for analysis has determined that Smyth, Huang and O’Brien are not classified in the same art field, and therefore unlikely to be combined with one another, then one of ordinary skill in the art would hardly be likely to combine Smyth with Huang and O’Brien in the manner suggested in the Office Action. Indeed, such a combination is unobvious.

In In re Sernaker, 217 U.S.P.Q. 1, 6 (C.A.F.C. 1983), the court stated: “[P]rior art references in combination do not make an invention obvious unless something in the prior art references would suggest the advantage to be derived from combining their teachings.” Furthermore, the court in Uniroyal, Inc. v. Rudkin-Wiley Corp., 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1434 (C.A.F.C. 1988), stated, “[w]here prior-art references require selective combination by the court to render

obvious a subsequent invention, there must be some reason for the combination other than the hindsight gleaned from the invention itself. . . . Something in the prior art must suggest the desirability and thus the obviousness of making the combination.” There is nothing in the prior art that refers to a suggestion or desirability of making the proposed combination. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is prima facie defective.

In the present application, the reason given to support the proposed combination is improper, and is not sufficient to selectively and gratuitously substitute parts of one reference for a part of another reference in order to try to meet, but failing nonetheless, the Applicants’ novel claimed invention. Moreover, there is nothing in the prior art references themselves, namely Smyth, Huang, and O’Brien, which suggests a motivation to combine elements from each reference in a manner consistent with the suggestion by the Office Action. Furthermore, the claimed invention meets the above-cited tests for obviousness by including embodiments such as “wherein the identifying process comprises any of graph analysis, statistical analysis, learning analysis, and response-time analysis, and wherein said learning analysis associates a penalty with an incorrect prediction of said components of said application that may be requested by said user in the future and biases a probability of selection of successive components more towards recently occurring historical patterns than older historical patterns;” and “wherein only said requested and identified components are adapted for operation with said requesting device.” As such, all of the claims of this application are, therefore, clearly in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the Examiner pass these claims to allowance and issue.

As declared by the Federal Circuit:

In proceedings before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, the Examiner bears the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness based upon the prior art. The Examiner can satisfy this burden only by showing some objective

teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references. In re Fritch, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992) citing In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Here, the Examiner has not met the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness. It is clear that, not only does Smyth fail to disclose all of the elements of the claims of the Applicants' claimed invention, but also, if combined with Huang and O'Brien, fails to disclose these elements as well. The unique elements of the claimed invention are clearly an advance over the prior art.

The Federal Circuit also went on to state:

The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification. . . . Here the Examiner relied upon hindsight to arrive at the determination of obviousness. It is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or "template" to piece together the teachings of the prior art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious. This court has previously stated that one cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention. Fritch at 1784-85, citing In re Gordon, 221 U.S.P.Q. 1125, 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Here, there is no suggestion that Smyth, alone, or in combination with Huang and O'Brien teaches a structure and method containing all of the limitations of the claimed invention. Consequently, there is absent the "suggestion" or "objective teaching" that would have to be made before there could be established the legally requisite "prima facie case of obviousness." In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that the collective cited prior art do not teach or suggest the features defined by amended independent claims 1, 11, 12, 22, 23, and 33 and as such, claims 1, 11, 12, 22, 23, and 33 are patentable over Smyth, alone, or in combination with Huang and O'Brien. Further, dependent claims 2-10, 13-21, and 24-32 are similarly patentable over Smyth, alone, or in combination with Huang and O'Brien, not only by

virtue of their dependency from patentable independent claims, respectively, but also by virtue of the additional features of the invention they define. Thus, the Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Moreover, the Applicants note that all claims are properly supported in the specification and accompanying drawings. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

IV. Formal Matters and Conclusion

With respect to the objections to the specification and drawings, the specification has been amended, above, to overcome the objection and a replacement drawings sheet is attached hereto to overcome the objection to the drawings. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objections to the specification and drawings.

With respect to the rejections to the claims, the claims have been amended, above, to overcome these rejections. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections to the claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1-33, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary. Please charge any deficiencies and credit any

overpayments to Attorney's Deposit Account Number 09-0441.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 27, 2006



Mohammad S. Rahman
Registration No. 43,029

Gibb I.P. Law Firm, LLC
2568-A Riva Road, Suite 304
Annapolis, MD 21401
Voice: (301) 261-8625
Fax: (301) 261-8825
Customer Number: 29154